

January '95

Volume 1.6



Newsletter

\$ 3.50

CARP, ONTARIO



LEFT TO RIGHT - STANDING: MIKE MCLARTY, TOM THEOFANOUS, DREW WILLIAMSON, ERROL BRUCE-KNAPP, GRAHAM LIGHTFOOT, JACQUES POULET, CHRISTIAN NAULT. - KNEELING: SUE KOVIOS, VICTOR LOURENCO, LISE THEOFANOUS, CHARLES COURVILLE.

-The Carp Case- The MUFON Ontario Version Part 6.

*by Tom Theofanous & Errol
Bruce-Knapp*

INSIDE

3	The Carp case - Part 6
7	Abductio Ad Absurdum
9	Aerial Encounters
12	Ufology in Canada
15	1975 Carman UFO Film

EDITORIAL NOTES

Victor Lourenco - Ontario Prov. Director
 (905) 569-0032
Tom Theofanous - Ontario Assist. Prov. Director
 (416) 249-0933
Drew Williamson - Toronto Section Director
 (416) 532-9371
Dorothy Lewis - Sarnia Section Director
 (519) 344-8248
Michel Deschamps - Sudbury Section Director
 (705) 969-3389
Brian Bower - Brantford Section Director
 (519) 752-3109
Ivan Sherlock - Thunder Bay Section Director
 (807) 345-2095

Address all correspondence to :

MUFON Ontario
3058 Fifth Line W. # 7
Mississauga, Ontario L5L 5W4
Canada

MUFON ONTARIO Newsletter is published bimonthly by the Mutual UFO Network (MUFON) in ONTARIO. All rights reserved. Reproduction without permission is strictly prohibited.

Published articles in the MUFON Ontario newsletter do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the MUFON leadership in Ontario. The authors are solely responsible for their written material unless expressed otherwise.

Subscription rates :

- \$25 Canadian Funds for Canadian Residents.
- \$25 U.S. Funds for Foreign Residents.

Make cheques or money order payable to:

MUFON ONTARIO

New appointments :

Brian Bower and Ivan Sherlock have been appointed to the positions of Provincial Section Director for Brantford and Thunder Bay respectively.

The present twenty-pages issue concludes our first year of publication, a project that would not be possible without the effort of a lot of people with common goals.

Twelve months ago we opened up with The Carp case on the front page, today we close that chapter in the Canadian UFO history.

In the name of MUFON Ontario, thank you all for the tremendous help you provided us throughout the year.

And...a particular word of appreciation to Professor Rodgers for her excellent effort and dedication to our Newsletter.

Victor Lourenco
 MUFON Provincial Director - Ontario

General Meeting

April 23rd, 1995 - 2 pm

140 St. George, Toronto
room 307

(Next to University of Toronto Library)

Investigator Training Courses

Due to a great deal of interest from our members, MUFON Ontario is planning to offer Investigator training courses. The courses will be designed to help the Trainee with investigative methods and procedures.

Dates and time to be determined.

If interested please contact :

Drew Williamson (416) 532-9371

or write to :

MUFON Ontario
 3058 Fifth Line West #7
 Mississauga, Ontario L5L 5W4

INVESTIGATION

The Carp Case - Part VI

-The MUFON Ontario version-

by Tom Theofanous & Errol Bruce-Knapp

This is the final part of the current series.

However, the story about, and the escapades of the people involved are far from over.

There is more to be told in this final part, along with some of our conclusions and we feel that you the reader will have been given sufficient evidence on the case to enable you to come to your own conclusions.

We've deliberately avoided publishing complete details of dates, conversations and documents, but we will be doing so in a complete and official MUFON Ontario Report, The Carp Case, in a few months.

By the way 'Oechsler' is pronounced 'Ex-ler' as in Ex-Lax...

THE RCMP

One of the areas of investigation that we've touched on only briefly in previous MUFON Ontario Newsletters was the RCMP Investigation and their subsequent report. Here are some more details:

Oechsler, on learning that Bobby Charlebois was probably 'Guardian', tried to persuade the RCMP to get involved in the case and investigate Charlebois. We assume that Oechsler hoped that the RCMP involvement might force Charlebois to admit to his being 'Guardian'.

Bobby Charlebois, it appeared to the RCMP, had done nothing against the law at the time, so Oechsler probably then tried to involve the Mounties by getting a Canadian citizen - Susan Gill - to lodge a complaint about 'low flying helicopters', using the Guardian Video to substantiate her allegations.

The RCMP, based on Gill's complaint, was obliged to conduct an investigation to:

1) ascertain if sufficient evidence was available to support a prosecution under the aeronautics act section 534(2), (b) for flying below 500 feet

2) ascertain if in fact the object observed was an aircraft and

3) ascertain if the object observed was a UFO.

On February 15th, 1993, RCMP Constable Dehaitre started his inquiries, and eventually came to some interestingly similar conclusions to ours, after our investigation.

He found, after talking to many of the residents of Manion Corners, near Carp, ON, (where the 'landing' took place), that the people involved in the complaint had a history of 'strange antics' with military paraphernalia (signs, war-games etc.) and had a fascination with UFOs and Government 'misinformation', etc.

When Constable Dehaitre talked to Charlebois by phone he was told that "the photograph of the 'aliens' was probably a mask and very easy to fake".

Const. Dehaitre talked briefly with the Labaneks, asking them about helicopters but, because of a family funeral they had just attended that day, they declined to talk and arranged for him to "come and talk another time".

Later, Bill Labanek told the Mountie that he was aware that the military signs had been on his property since 1991 but didn't do anything about them.

After the RCMP had concluded their investigation, Labanek told Graham Lightfoot that she and Charlebois were currently being harassed by Constable Dehaitre and that he had asked them to sign a form "stating that what they saw was a helicopter".

Graham, not knowing at the time about what really was going on with the RCMP investigation, lodged a complaint with Constable Dehaitre's superiors on behalf of the Labaneks. The response was that the officer had barely talked to the Labaneks, that he conducted himself very professionally and that he would have had no reason to harass them in such a manner.

Much later, Tom and Graham spoke with Constable Dehaitre who showed them some of the correspondence that Oechsler had sent him and statements that Oechsler had made. The constable observed that during his contact with Oechsler it was very obvious to him that Oechsler was using 'his witnesses', the RCMP, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Transportation as 'tools' to craft the story the way he wanted. What's more, the so-called 'witnesses' were going along with Oechsler's plan.

THE RCMP DOCUMENTS & 'ACCESS OF INFORMATION'

In March of 1993 members of O.C.I.P.E. (Organisation de Compilation et d'Information sur les Phenomenes Etranges) of Quebec and its leader, Christian Page, met with Tom & Lise Theofanous and agreed to help them obtain a copy of the The RCMP Report from Christian Page.

Christian had filed an information request with the Mounties for the Report which contained a summary and conclusions of the RCMP investigation.

We knew that constable Dehaitre had talked to many of the key people involved in the 'Carp Caper' and we were most interested in his original notes on the case. However, we were stymied by our lack of knowledge of the RCMP's method of indexing and coding any paperwork generated during the course of an investigation - we needed to know which index numbers to specifically quote in a request under the Access of Information Act.

Fortune smiled on us at exactly the right time - in the form of a very bright young man named Ian Rogers.

Ian had called Oechsler at his home in Maryland, having seen the 'Encounters' tv show on the FOX Network, and was given the 'story' from Oechsler's perspective. Oechsler asked Ian to see if he could retrieve copies of Dehaitre's original notes since he was not a citizen of Canada and unable to do so himself.

Ian, through a contact, sourced the indexing and coding information and obtained a copy of the Dehaitre's original report. On reading it, Ian realized that Oechsler had not told him the truth about the 'case' and Oechsler's 'story' did not correspond with the RCMP's documents at all. Ian

decided not to pass Oechsler any copies of the documents.

This prompted anger from Oechsler and threats of a 'law suit' if he did not pass on the information.

Ian then tried to find other UFO researchers who might be working on the Carp 'Case'. He connected with Grant Wakefield in Vancouver and sent him a copy of the RCMP documents. Grant passed them on to the Director for MUFON Canada, Mike Strainic, also in Vancouver B.C. and the next day Mike passed them on to us in Toronto.

Ian Rogers and an associate also managed to meet and talk with Constable Dehaitre in Ottawa. The constable reiterated the same information he had given Graham and Tom at their meeting with him, talked about his meetings with various "witnesses", Oechsler's transparency, 'low flying helicopters' and the Guardian video.

CONCLUSIONS

The RCMP had no interest in the case until a complaint was lodged by a citizen and they were obliged to respond - which they did and their conclusions completed their involvement with this case.

The DND was asked by Oechsler if they had any of their helicopters flying low and causing the problems the Labaneks claimed they had. DND investigated and concluded that they had no flights over that area at any of the times that the Labaneks had complained about.

One of our members, who works for the DOT, was asked by Oechsler to obtain weather information for the date of the event - which he did as a favor to a fellow ufologist, and that was the extent of their 'assistance'.

We feel that the RCMP investigation, DND and DOT were used by Oechsler and the 'witnesses' in an attempt to turn an unbelievable, faltering story about a 'UFO landing' into an intricate 'Government Conspiracy'.

These agencies were approached by Oechsler specifically so that he could later state, on numerous occasions that he "wanted to thank [enter agency name!] for co-operating with me", and also claimed they (the agencies) did so because of his "connections within the intelligence community".

Oechsler published all the agency names as having been helpful to him in his 'investigation' because of his 'connections' and because the event was 'real' and those agencies had an interest in the 'story' themselves.

All in all, the case itself, from the outset in 1989, was and is an out and out hoax. It was built up and embroidered upon by a lying, self-appointed, self-styled 'Investigative Researcher' who knows how to manipulate the media and an unsuspecting public, all of whom had no way of knowing all the details of the story.

Oechsler's game plan worked for a while but clearly he did not expect anyone to get in his way. He severely underestimated his ability to control the people who knew what was going on with threats of law-suits, by calling them 'debunkers' or by trying to buy them off.

The outcome? Oechsler had to resign from the field claiming that he needed to "extricate myself from this eternal abyss and return to the family life that I've sorely neglected".

Curiously, at no time since the Carp 'Story' broke, have Oechsler, Macabbee, the Labaneks, Gill, or Charlebois pointed out any discrepancies in any of our findings, by letter to us, any of the UFO press or on the computer networks.

Oechsler has only bothered to tell a few individuals and MUFON Headquarters in Seguin, Texas that he was going to sue us and anybody else involved in publicizing the true story because we were "taking his livelihood away".

Of course, we would be remiss not to mention:

- a) the anonymous letter that was sent to Chris Rutkowski mailed from Albany, NY and
- b) the posting of a series of 'reviews' of some of our published findings in this newsletter, by a mysterious person named 'ALEX from Quebec'.

On the National Capital FreeNet in Ottawa, 'ALEX from Quebec' complained that we used character bashing and threatening of the 'witness' Gill to achieve our 'debunking' results.

'ALEX' apparently didn't have computer network access (just like Oechsler!) and used a member of a small group of 'Carp: We want it to be true' die-hards in Ottawa to disseminate the results of an 'investigation'.

The letter and the 'ALEX' messages smacked of Oechsler's writing style and contained information to which only he and we were privy. And we thought the similarity between the names 'Oechsler' (Ex-Ler) and 'ALEX' was interesting too...

Gill did once threaten MUFON Ontario verbally via the phone, to Victor, saying that she would sue us if we publicized her name, which might create problems for her at her work place. A good time to think about 'job security' after all the nonsense of her 'story', no?

It seems to us that we've either done a good job in our research and investigation or the above mentioned individuals are patsies and we don't think so.

In conclusion our findings are as follows:

- 1) The Labaneks, Bobby Charlebois, Pavel Farfara and possibly others were involved in creating a Hoax video and distributing it as a recording of a 'UFO landing'.
- 2) That Susan Gill's story was used to pad the Carp event, even though her 'event' occurred (if at all) at a different time.
- 3) Oechsler used his manipulative ability to build a story even though he knew of the circumstances and exactly what was going on and together with Bruce Macabbee, intentionally misled the public, the media and ufology using unethical means, and bad judgement in order to benefit financially and personally.
- 4) That the Guardian video of a 'UFO landing' has, after analysis, proved inconclusive and likely is either a pick-up truck or (according to the RCMP investigation) a helicopter.

THANKS

We would like to thank all the people who helped us resolve this intriguing 'case' - resolved in our minds and in the minds of the following people:

- First and foremost Graham Lightfoot for the tireless, countless hours he spent on this case on his own and with us, for not breaking down despite unscrupulous tactics by Oechsler & Oechsler's 'friends'.

- 'Our' group : Victor Lourenco, Drew Williamson, Sue Kovios, Chuck Courville, Wayne St. John and Vaughn Killin.

- OICEPE's Jacques Poulet, Christian Nault and the 'chief' - Christian Page, for their help in obtaining the RCMP report, putting the real story out and for the energy they expended on the actual investigation.

- To all the people across Canada who nudged, prodded and guided - the independant Chris Rutkowski, Mike Strainic, Grant Wakefield, Mike McLarty, 'Sandy' and several others who don't want to be mentioned but who made major contributions.

- Special thanks to Ian Rogers and Associates for the courage and tenacity they showed in ferreting out much truth on the case, without whose help we might never have found out as much as we did.

- Thanks to Tom's wife Lise, she was beside him throughout the years of the case, everywhere we went - through rain, mud, snow, humidity, heat and our highs and lows.

- Last but not least thanks to all those individuals around the planet whose encouragement and snippets of information added much to a very difficult and long task, especially MUFON Headquarters in Seguin, Texas, (thanks Dennis Stacy) and Vicky Cooper Ecker & shiney new husband Don Ecker of UFO MAGAZINE and UFOs Tonite for not being afraid of the truth.

We consider this case closed and will now turn our attention to the completion of 'Carp: The Official MUFON Ontario Report'.

We will keep you up-to-date on the inevitable attempts by Oechsler and that strange group of people in Carleton County to discredit us and will endeavour to block all attempts by Oechsler to 'come-back'.

Articles for publication : in computer format by preference. Word, WordPerfect for Windows, MS-DOS, MAC or Amiga, ASCII, Text, etc. Modern transfer is also available.

If typed: Original sheet (*no Xerox*) and one line spaced to facilitate the scanning process.

Ufology in Canada - Continued from page 13

In concluding the fifth meeting of Second Storey, it was agreed that a further meeting would take place after the Department of Transport had completed its analysis. That is, after the Magnet Report was finished. This was accomplished on August 10, 1953 but there are no minutes available of any further Second Storey meetings, although there is evidence that further meetings did take place. One wonders why the minutes were not made public. Recent correspondence between Canadian ufologist Arthur Bray and Dr. Allen McNamara (without even having been asked the question) that the Project Magnet Report was submitted to Second Storey in 1953. (This from a letter dated July 25, 1979.) (17) So it was 26 years before any indication of further Second Storey meetings surfaced.

Sources

- (1) Memorandum to the Controller of Telecommunications, W.B. Smith, November 21, 1950, p.2.
- (2) *ibid*, p.2.
- (3) *ibid*, p.2.
- (4) *ibid*, p.3.
- (5) *ibid*, p.4.
- (6) *ibid*, p.4.
- (7) Project Magnet, program, W.B. Smith, p.2.
- (8) Ottawa Journal, April 16, 1952.
- (9) Toronto Globe & Mail, April 16, 1952.
- (10) Ottawa Journal, April 17, 1952.
- (11) 'I Believe Flying Saucers Come From Outer Space', by Alan Philips, Weekend Magazine, V.7, #27, 1957, p.4.
- (12) Minutes of a DRB meeting to discuss flying saucers, April 22, 1952, p.1.
- (13) *ibid*. p.1.
- (14) *ibid*. p.2.
- (15) Interim Report on Project Magnet, W.B. Smith, 1952.
- (16) Minutes of the 5th Second Storey meeting, March 9, 1953, p.2
- (17) The UFO Connection, Arthur Bray, Jupiter Publishing, 1979, p.69

To be continued...

David Haisell is the author of "The Missing Seven Hours" published in October 1978.



Across the Great White North

Abductio Ad Absurdum
by Michael Strainic

MUFON Canadian National Director

Without any doubt, the most Frequently Asked Question I receive – except of course for “what’s a brilliant and handsome guy like you doing in a wacky field like this?” – is, “How do I go about investigating an abduction case?” Well, that’s a fair enough question. And it’s one that should only take about 20 years to answer properly, so let’s get started, shall we.....?

In truth, investigating an abduction case is really not much different than investigating any other UFO report. The same types of things are required, things like objectivity, a level-headed approach, thoroughness, and the like. But perhaps the primary difference in investigating an abduction case is learning to deal with the exceptionally heavy emotional involvement on the part of the experient. Consequently, you will have to wear several different hats: friend, investigator, psychologist, researcher, psychiatrist, and more.

Whatever insights are provided here come from a variety of sources: reading the available literature (all of it!), studying the few statistical overviews that exist, personal experience in the field and the experiences of colleagues, and hopefully, that most rare and uncommon entity, Common Sense. So far, **UFO*BC** has logged – from British Columbia, and primarily from the Vancouver area – a total of 162 possible abduction cases. These reports cover a time span of 22 years, and many of these are still under investigation. This case load has given us considerable material to draw from, and enough has been learned that we are now able to approach these cases in a more direct manner, cutting certain corners and lingering longer on others. Some of our techniques in BC are a little different,

perhaps even unorthodox to some, but they have proven to be highly workable and very productive.

First of all, it has to be mentioned that not only is there no etched-in-stone “correct” way to handle an abduction case, there are not even any generally-accepted guidelines for defining an abduction case. The Code of Ethics drafted at the MIT Abduction Study Conference is merely meant to be guidelines for ethicality, i.e., a best-case scenario for dealing with these problematical reports. So consider this to be simply a “how we do it” narrative, with some pointers and hints that may save you some valuable time. Through time and experience, we all find our own way to approach an investigation. Ultimately, whatever works best for you, works best.

So, you’ve just received a UFO report, and for whatever reason, you suspect you may be dealing with a potential abduction case. You’re armed with your Form 1, your clipboard, pencils, your arsenal of questions, your tape recorder (you *do* have your tape recorder, don’t you? If not, please refer to Great White North #2...), now what? The late French mathematician, philosopher and UFO researcher Aimé Michel once referred to the UFO phenomenon as a “Festival of Absurdities.” Very appropriate, in my opinion. So, grab a front row seat and let the Festival begin.....

Perhaps the hardest thing to get used to is the concept of approaching every UFO case as having at least the potential for being an abduction case. This is not to suggest that every UFO case is in fact a latent abduction case, nor does it imply that we are “looking for abduction cases” everywhere. What it does mean, however, is that we have learned that abduction cases do sometimes lurk within standard, cut-and-dried UFO reports. Proper – and very simple – questioning and interrogation techniques can open some long-closed doors, and bring out not only typical abduction scenarios, but other not-so-typical things as well. It is a very large can that we sometimes open, and once it is opened, not only can a Grey pop out, but a whole shopping list of other vermiform creatures can present themselves as well. And some of what oozes out of this can may be quite upsetting for those investigators who feel that the abduction question is a fairly simple and straightforward (albeit bizarre) situation. There are more things in Heaven and Earth, etc., etc. Forewarned is forearmed.

It has been said that the best UFO/abduction investigators are the media. While I would certainly argue that point, on the surface at least it is true. The journalistic approach of the five Ws – Who, What, Where, When and Why – covers all the basics of any investigation of any kind. So, after taking care of these journalistic basics, it is time to poke around elsewhere. When interviewing any UFO witness, we have a “checklist” of questions to ask and avenues to explore. These can be considered as “door openers,” or as my colleague Graham Conway would put it, “we’re on a fishing expedition.”

The UFO phenomenon in its various guises may be far more intertwined in our lives than we suspect. For example, the very basic and seldom-asked question, “Have you ever seen a UFO before this?” frequently elicits a definite positive response; even larger numbers reply in the affirmative to the question “Have any of your family members ever seen a UFO?” Then, if you quickly add to this something like, “Go back as far as you can recall. Have there been any other strange events in your life/your family’s lives...?” and there’s a good chance you’ll have more than enough to delve into. And this is often when things get really strange.

After asking these few questions, you may well hear, for example, that the child of the family has been mentioning lately a “little man” that appears in his room at night and talks to him. Or you may hear about how Aunt Martha was extremely psychic and used to see all kinds of things, especially balls of light in her room. Or that after her Close Encounter, a woman can no longer go near a computer without crashing it, or about radios that won’t work in her presence, or televisions that change channels randomly as she walks by. After witnessing a disk over their house, a couple now believes that they have a poltergeist in residence. If they hadn’t been awakened from a sound sleep by that very loud boom (the boom that no-one else heard), the family would never have seen the huge triangle-shaped object glide noiselessly over their house. And so on, and so on, and so on. The Festival continues....

So this is the type of thing that the experiencers have told you, a host of strange events which may or may not relate to a possible UFO event. This is what has been told to you directly, but there is more that you discover as well during your investigation. When you ask the witness to sketch what they saw, they mumble something about not being very good at drawing. That’s usually when they hand you a drawing that easily could have

been done by a professional artist. Their name – be it a first name or surname – is one that you have encountered many times just recently. You discover that the witness has, practically overnight, developed an all-consuming interest in medicine, ancient history, botany, or any one of a long list of interests completely incongruous with their former mindset, an interest which compels them to read cover-to-cover every book in the library on that particular topic.

Often, these people need to go out and “preach the gospel,” as it were. What has happened to them is so important that they will tell anybody at any time the complete details of their experience. Sometimes, this facet of the experience gets out of hand, until the experiencer begins to see every light in the sky as a *bona fide* UFO. Occasionally, the person actually does go on the lecture circuit, regaling the audience with convoluted stories of the Pleaideans or whatever group of “aliens” they feel they have interacted with. This can be a real problem for the investigator, who knows that the original experience was valid, yet the later events appear to be merely by-products of the abduction scenario. What exactly is the meaning, or purpose, of this apparently induced state of duality?

You then learn that the witnesses have moved 14 times in the last two years. They never live on anything other than the ground floor of a building. Their marriage is becoming shaky. When you pursue this part of the story, you learn that the uncommunicative spouse has been having at least some sort of experience, and is not dealing well with it at all.

And then you go for the Big One – the power lines. Chances are, when you look around, you will find that the witnesses live within a quarter mile of high-tension power lines, or have power lines near the house, or have a transformer in their yard, or something similar. This “power-line connection” has proved to be the single most consistent feature in the abduction cases that we have studied. This particular information has been passed on to several major abduction researchers who were unaware of this connection, and they have since verified that this is prevalent all over North America. What the meaning of this might be – are the power lines attracting UFOs, or acting as a “carrier signal,” or actually causing the experiences, or whatever – is completely unknown. It is, however, so commonplace that it needs to be

Continued on page 10

INVESTIGATION

Aerial Encounters

From MUFON Ontario Case Reports
by *Victor Lourenco*

The witness' real identity can not be disclosed and therefore a fictitious name is being used. Real name is on MUFON Ontario files.

As a professional pilot, Alex Dupont is alert to his airspace and familiar with his environment. He is aware of various aspects of natural, and normal nocturnal events such as: bright stars, lights that appear to bounce and move erratically, distant tower lights, strobe lights, aircraft lights, etc. Last year he met with two unusual situations, that puzzled him to an extreme.

On February 27, 1994, Alex was flying a light, twin engine aircraft, when he spotted a strange, colorful and bright light ahead of him. It was twenty to thirty miles ahead of his position and nearly ground level. Initially, not knowing quite what to make of it, he thought that it could possibly be someone doing work on a bush-road.

Then he realized that the light seemed to be maneuvering in an erratic manner; laterally, as well as vertically. It rapidly gained altitude, and then, shot upwards.

He perceived that as the light moved toward him, it seemed to change color and shape, from a ball to a saucer type object.

Concerned about what he was observing, Alex altered his course, from 70 degrees to probably 360 degrees. This did not make a difference, as the object then followed the aircraft, paralleling his course about 400 yards away.

At this point he was flying at an altitude of 7,000 ft., with a speed of 160 MPH. Alex was scared, and intimidated by the maneuverability and greater speed of the object. He decided, hesitantly at first, to contact Thunder Bay via his radio.

Meanwhile the object dived out of sight, returned and remained a few minutes, and again, dived toward the ground. Alex decided to circle the area, but was unable to regain visual contact.



Computer art by Victor Lourenco

When first seen the object appeared to be half-moon shaped, and as it got closer it appeared more to be an oblong; rounder on top and flatter on the bottom, something like an egg. It also seemed to change colour as it got closer, getting darker with a rim. No lights were visible. It's estimated size was fifty feet across and twenty to twenty-five feet high. There was no affect on the aircraft.

The second unusual sighting took place two nights later. Alex was flying the same aircraft, on the same course 70 degrees, heading to the same destination near Hudson's Bay coast.

He left his departure point around 11:00 PM; on a crystal clear winter night with unlimited visibility. He climbed steadily until he reached his enroute altitude of 7,500 ft. As he leveled off, he noticed a strange "trail" in the sky. It was clearly visible because of it's bluish hue, and was about 100 feet in depth. Since the "trail" lead in the same direction as he had planned to go, he began to parallel it.

Then he noticed a red light ahead of him, moving towards the Indian community of Landsdown House. Driven by curiosity, he switched his radio to different frequencies hoping to hear an approach announcement, but no voices were heard.

By then he could see several colored lights of red, green, and white, plus pulsating strobe that curved left and downward. Thinking this to be an aircraft, he waited for the "pilot" to activate the runway lights by clicking his microphone button. This did not happen, and he thought it to be strange.

When Alex was within 15 miles of the Indian community, he noticed lights on the north west side, at about 20 miles, which were close to the

ground. He decided to turn and head for these lights. Suddenly, to his surprise, these lights began coming towards his aircraft at an incredible speed, without gaining altitude.

Abruptly, the lights stopped approaching. Alex became frustrated. He had been hoping for the improved visibility, as the lights crossed a lake. He could observe only lights; red, white, green, and a white strobe, and the reflection off snow and trees.

Again the strangeness of the situation prompted his feeling of apprehension, which gave way to fear. Then the lights hovered, went north, returned south, and hovered again. Alex could not get any closer to the lights. Continuing with this futile endeavor could lead to disorientation.

Instead he opted to turn back on a steady course. The lights paralleled his course off his right wing tip at about ten miles out. At times this distance closed to five miles. Fifteen miles farther the lights were holding the same position relative to his wing, which meant they were moving.

Next the lights quit this course and suddenly returned to the location where he had first observed them, north west of Landsdown House. He noted cabin lights could still be seen at distances of up to 80 miles away.

Then the most surprising event occurred when the lights stopped and pulsated a series of bright strobe-type pulses. Another light holding at about 30,000 ft high in the sky returned the pulse. This interchange would repeat five or six times. The light close to the ground would pulsate almost in Morse code like sequences and the second light (star-type) would blink in a similar series. Both of these lights never emitted their sequences at the same time. They were one after the other, although the response time was split second.

Once the series ended the higher light went from stationary, to a southeast heading at a high rate of speed. The ground light continued a "search" pattern display, close to the ground while moving in a north easterly direction.

Alex looked backward just in time to see a spectacular "explosion" of orange light on the horizon, and then nothing.

Alex did not fly anymore of these night trips after this date, due to inclement winter weather.

Two weeks later, on the ground at Winnimusa Lake, Alex and another pilot observed a set of red, green and strobe lights at tree top height. The lights bounced, weaved and fluttered, for 20 minutes, then descended and disappeared.

The case is still under investigation...

Abductio Ad Absurdum - Continued from page 8

investigated in depth. The power line connection and its significance may provide some important and valuable clues as to the true nature of the abduction experience. In one recent case here on the coast, we learned that a two-year-old child (whose parents had just had a close encounter) was afraid to sleep in her room because a "baby" kept materializing in an upper corner of her room. When we looked at where the "baby" was supposed to appear, we saw that it was directly in front of a panel on the wall. And what was behind this panel? Well, it just happened to be all the circuit breakers and wiring junctions for the entire house. When we pointed out the UFO/power line connection, we were informed by the witnesses that this small three bedroom house was somehow sucking up more than \$600 in electricity per month. The neighbours were paying only about \$130 per month. Oh, yes, and where were the power lines? Well, right around the corner, and just down the road a piece, was the almost requisite set of pylons and high-tension lines. Big surprise.

Everything related here is a mix 'n match set of examples. All of these situations have been reported many times, though not in any particular order or relationship. They are commonplace occurrences. And they seem to be completely unknown to a large number of investigators and researchers. Scratch. Dig. Burrow. Delve. Ask door-opening questions, open the floodgates, and stand back. You may find that there are many other equally weird infobits that will baffle equally.

The Festival is in full swing. Please remain in your seat, and enjoy the passing parade!

MUFONet BBS Data Line

(512) 556-2524

MUFON Members free of charge

(Note: Long distance charges will be applied through your local Phone company)

UFOLOGY IN CANADA Past, Present & Future

by David Haisell

Part One

Presented to BUFORA's 2nd London International UFO Congress, London, England, May 25, 1981

Ufology in Canada has evolved over the last thirty years in much the same way as in many other countries, namely a disorganised and fairly erratic manner. This comes as no surprise to most people, since those attracted to the study span a wide spectrum of backgrounds, interests and motivation, and thus much disagreement has existed among them, the general public and that group of persons to who I shall refer as 'the authorities', being comprised of those to whom the media seem to turn for comments on the phenomenon we now call UFOs.

Unfortunately for Canada, these problems are compounded by two additional factors, namely its immense size and sparsely distributed population. The area per interested and capable investigator/researcher adds up to many thousands of square miles.

Also, basic extrapolation, if valid, would imply that most UFO related events in Canada would go unnoticed and hence unreported because of the large areas of the nation with little or no population.

To put things in perspective I shall compare Canada's size and population with those of the United Kingdom. The UK has an area of 94,212 square miles, with a population of 55,534,000 (1976 figures).

This averages out to 590 persons per square mile. On the other hand Canada covers an area of 3,851,809 square miles, over 40 times the area of the UK. With a population of only 21,489,000 this averages out to 5.4 persons per square mile. Thus the UK, has over 100 times the population density of Canada.

When one considers that 13,730,000 or 64% of Canada's population live in Ontario and Quebec which cover 1,007,442 square miles or only 26% of the nation's area, this means that only 36% of the population or 7,759,000 people live in 74% of the area, namely 2,844,367 square miles. Thus the other 8 provinces and two territories have only

2.7 persons per square mile. The UK then, has 200 times the average population density of 3/4 of Canada.

The situation goes from the sublime to the ridiculous when one considers that the two territories (the Yukon and the N.W. Territories) which are almost 40% of Canada's land area, (or 16 times the area of the UK) have a total population of only 51,000 people. That's 30 square miles per person! Imagine having a back yard measuring 5 miles by 6 miles! That's a lot of grass to cut - or snow to shovel! To compound the problem even further there are only a few active UFO groups in Canada, far fewer than in England.

Nevertheless, ufology has had quite an interesting and productive history in Canada, and I shall now relate what I hope are some of the highlights as well as some of the little known, but significant, happenings which have occurred over the years, particularly in relation to the involvement of the Canadian Government.

Canada's initial involvement in UFO investigation, or flying saucer investigation at the time, apparently came more than three years after the Kenneth Arnold incident in the U.S., and the accompanying 'flaps' of 1947.

It happened in an inauspicious manner, but was destined to be plague by the usual amount of intrigue and double talk which seems to be characteristic of most government sponsored projects surround controversial material. The initiator of the investigation was one Wilbert B. Smith, a senior radio engineer with the Canadian Department of Transport. Smith's area of research was in radio wave propagation, a study which eventually led him into fields such as auroras, cosmic radiation, atmospheric radio-activity and geo-magnetism. (1) It was the latter of these fields which really attracted his attention and caused him to speculate that the potential energy of the Earth's magnetic field might be extracted and used. He had already progressed to the stage of developing a crude experimental model to demonstrate his theory, and successfully tested the unit which, in his words, "demonstrated the soundness of the basic principles in a qualitative manner and provided useful data for the design of a better unit." (2) He believed, and I again quote, "that we are on the track of something which may well prove to be the introduction to a new technology."

This "is borne out by the investigations which are being carried on at the present time in relation to flying saucers." (3) The investigations he was referring to were those being carried out by the US Government at that time. In late 1950 Smith had attended a North American Radio Broadcasting conference in Washington, D.C., and while there, made enquires through the Canadian Embassy staff who were able to inform him that:

- a) the matter of UFOs was the most highly classified subject in the US, rating higher than the H-bomb,
- b) UFOs exist,
- c) their modus operandi is unknown, but concentrated effort is being made by a small group headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, (Editor: Of 'MJ12' fame)
- d) the entire matter is considered by US authorities to be of tremendous significance. (4)

A concerted effort is now being made to discover the identities of these Canadian Embassy officials in the hope of identifying their sources for these claims.

Smith felt the preliminary result of his work in geo-magnetism correlated with the available data on reported UFO behavior, and that they were fairly close to some of the answers. And this was thirty-one years ago! The Defence Research Board liaison officer at the Canadian Embassy in Washington evidently agreed with Smith for he was extremely anxious for him to get in touch with Dr. Solandt, Chairman of the Defence Research Board upon Smith's return to Ottawa, to discuss with him future investigations along the line of geo-magnetism energy release.

Consequently, upon his return to Canada, Smith met with Solandt on November 20, and obtained his support. Solandt agreed that work on geo-magnetic energy should proceed as rapidly as possible and offered DRB's cooperation in providing laboratory facilities, acquisition of equipment, and specialized personnel. (5)

On November 21 he outlined his proposal in writing to the Controller of Telecommunications, indicating DRB's support and requesting that a project be set up and carried out on a part-time

basis "until such time as sufficient results would warrant more definitive action". (6)

The proposal outlined seven avenues of investigation, all dealing with geo-magnetic research, none dealing with UFO investigation. (7) He proposed the work be classified since he felt that the lesser known and little explored aspects of magnetism might hold the key to a new and significant technology, and its impact on our civilization would have to be assessed if his suspicions proved correct. Commander C.P. Edwards, then Deputy Minister of Transport for Air Services gave the project his blessing, requesting that he be kept posted from time to time. It is curious that the avenues of investigation Smith proposed made no reference to UFOs. Could it have been that Smith willfully omitted such reference in order to ensure a greater probability that the project would be approved? Or was he only interested in UFOs because they seemed to be demonstrating that some of his concepts were apparently being applied, whereas his main interest was indeed in the new technology which he felt he was on the verge of initiating?

There seems to be evidence for both points of view, but since I don't want to analyze Smith's career at this time I shall not pursue that issue any further. It is enough at this moment to recognise that Smith's curiosity was responsible for Project Magnet's initiation in November 1950, and for its relatively secret progress for a few years at least. It is significant, though, that the official 'Magnet' report, when eventually released many years later, dealt only with UFO sighting analysis, and made no mention of Smith's geo-magnetics research.

Curiously, the Canadian government in all its wisdom, saw the need for still another project to analyze UFO reports, less classified than Project Magnet, but still confidential. During the early months of 1952 there was a noticeable increase in the number of UFO incidents covered by the Canadian Press. (8,9,10) Several of these involved reports of disc-shaped craft over Royal Canadian Air Force bases, many reported by service personnel themselves.

The Defence Research Board (DRB) noted this increase, and DRB chairman Solandt asked staff member Harold Oatway to get a committee together "to see if we can make anything out of these flying saucer reports". (11) Had Solandt forgotten about Smith and Magnet? It's doubtful.

Oatway was a friend of Smith and knew of his involvement.

As we shall see Smith had not been forgotten, but the reason for setting up a further project remains unclear, unless, of course, Smith was too busy with his research. Why they didn't merely enlarge Magnet remains a mystery.

On April 22, 1952, the committee gathered by Oatway held its first meeting, with Peter Millman, head of the Dominion Observatory, as its chairman. Smith, Edwards and Solandt were also among those present.

It was agreed that there was a need to formally investigate UFOs, and that a committee should be formed to lead this activity and to standardize procedures, etc. (12) From the minutes of this meeting we read, "This committee was to prepare a brief of instructions for observers; examine interrogation; and to establish a standard method of recording and indexing for subsequent analysis." (13) (And if I may be permitted, I would like to note that thirty years later, we are still doing the same thing!) It was also decided that "the function of DRB should be mainly advisory as the collection of reports could best be done by field organizations." (14)

Two days later, the newly formed committee assembled, classifying its work as 'confidential', and identifying themselves as 'Project Theta'.

On May 19, 1952 they met for a second time and among other things, re-named themselves 'Project Second Storey' since 'Theta' was apparently not on the list of valid names for projects of this type.

I hope I am not boring you with these details, but it is quite interesting to not how the activities of 'Magnet' and 'Second Storey' dovetailed at this time, how each affected the other, and finally and more significantly, when public awareness of their activities developed, how they rapidly came to a close.

On June 25, 1952 Smith submitted an interim report on Project Magnet in which he stated that it appeared evident that flying saucers are emissaries from other civilizations and actually operate on magnetic principles, magnetic principles which we have failed to grasp due to our not paying enough attention to the structure of fields in our study of physics. (15) One wonders what reaction Smith caused!

One can almost hear the hurried whispers, and see the startled faces and raised eyebrows.

On July 31, Project Second Storey held their third meeting where, among other items of business, a letter containing several of Smiths motions, presumably based on his progress in Magnet, was tabled and discussed. Also, the final form of the 'Project Second Storey Sighting Report' was approved, and distribution of same was determined.

There was no mention in the minutes of any reference to Smiths decisive statement in his interim 'Magnet' report.

The fourth meeting of Second Storey was not held until November 17, followed by the fifth on March 9, 1953. Smith had been working on some 'weighting factors' to be applied to witness testimony to help arrive at some measure of report significance. At the fifth meeting his system was adopted temporarily without alterations. At this point, though, it was probably felt irrelevant since Chairman Millman noted "that evidence to date (and note that this was not Second Storey's evidence to which he was referring, since they had so far only managed to standardize their procedures) did not seem to warrant an all out investigation by the Canadian Services but it might be well to continue to collect at some central location all forms which may be submitted to the Services." (16) Millman reached this conclusion following discussions with the chairman of DRB on the future activities of the committee. They seemed to be again ignoring Smith's statement in his preliminary report on Magnet; or were they trying to play it down?

And as it turned out, Millman's conclusion was based on activities in the U.S. in the wake of the Robertson Panel, which is now known to have been a CIA whitewash. So here is further evidence of top level U.S. Canadian inter-relationship in the UFO field, and if we assume this inter-relationship continued after the Robertson Panel, it is safe to assume that investigation of UFOs in Canada was placed under the control of some branch of Canadian Intelligence. We have more evidence for this from none other than Prime Minister Trudeau, as I shall relate later. We can only guess that Smith's interim 'Magnet' report probably played a significant part in this assumed decision.

Continued on page 6

MAIL

Comment on "Flying Saucers Re-Viewed"

by *Chris Rutkowski*

I'd like to respond to Mike Strainic's article in the latest issue of your MUFON Ontario Newsletter. He suggested that someone take the time to write a comprehensive history of Canadian ufology.

His suggestion was prompted by his discovery and perusal of the files of the late Bill Allan. The richness of the files were, by his regard, quite impressive. He recommended that other treasure troves of Canadian ufology be sought and retrieved so that present-day ufologists might have some background upon which to build their theories.

My comment is that this has been done as much as has been possible.

Mike is personally familiar with my quest to locate the files of the defunct Canadian Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (CAPRO) and my frustrated efforts to retrieve them.

I have always attempted to promote Canadian ufology in my articles in foreign publications, as I feel we have contributed much to ufological knowledge. Names like Bill Allan, John Magor, John Musgrave, Arthur Bray, David Haisell and even Wilbert Smith have all make their marks upon ufology.

I documented this in a historical review of Canadian ufology in Jerry Clark's UFO Encyclopedia, Volume 1, as a commissioned entry running seven pages. I drew upon several previous sources of Canadian ufological history, including:

UFO OCCUPANTS & CRITTERS: THE PATTERNS IN CANADA by John Musgrave, Amherst Press, 1979.

UFOS IN CANADA by Arthur Bray, UFO Research Centre: Ontario, 1978.

PROJECT UFO CANADA by David Haisell, 1980

Davis Haisell presented a history of Canadian Ufology in his JOURNAL UFO which ceased publication in 1981.

In other words, there was a conscious attempt to gather Canadian ufological data together up until about 1982. Much of this historical information is available and has been published. There is no question that such information would be of interest to present-day Canadian ufologists.

Part of the reason for publishing my SWAMP GAS JOURNAL was to remain in communication with Canadian ufologists and to make sure that information was being exchanged. In the late 1980's I began a concerted effort to solicit cooperation from truly active Canadian ufologists by asking for current UFO report data that would be compiled into an annual survey of Canadian UFO activity. After five years of annual surveys, the interest and international attention to Canadian ufology has persisted. Once again, Canadian ufology is a major factor in UFO research around the world. David Gotlib's work in abduction research is highly-regarded; Grant Cameron's MJ-12 research is noted in most good publications; and the information superhighway is filled with Canadian contributions to UFO groups and chat sections.

In conclusion, I echo Mike's call for a gathering of historical Canadian UFO research records, but I would like to note that some of this has already been done, though relative newcomers to the field might not be aware of the efforts in this regard. I would encourage other researchers to find sources of UFO information and help be a part of the new resolve to understand the UFO phenomenon.

UFO UpDates

The BBS of MUFON Ontario



MUFON Ontario is now operating a computer bulletin board system

To become a user of MUFON Ontario's UFO UpDates BBS please call us at 416-932-0031 and leave

your name and voice telephone number on our voice-mail - we'll call you back and give you a validation number to be used the first time you log-on. The BBS will recognise you and you'll be able to call at anytime, 24 hours a day. Please note that this is the only way that anyone will be able to become a user of UFO UpDates.

Broadcast Version of the 1975 Carman UFO Film Altered

by Robert R. Young

On May 13, 1975, a few seconds of film was taken near Carman, Manitoba, Canada, showing one or more bright images against the sky. These images were alleged to be the "Charlie Red Star" ufo reported seen at the time near Carman. Portions of the film were broadcast soon afterwards on a Winnipeg television station, and later in a special by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. A copy of this film was shown on an October 14, 1988, Fox Television Network special, "UFO Coverup - Live!". A videotape of most of this program with the Carman segment was sold by Kodak videotapes as "UFO's: the unsolved mystery". Copies of the film have been sold by the man who took the pictures. Another version of the film has been shown and televised by a UFO lecturer in the United States.

Winnipeg investigator Chris Rutkowski has provided the following account from the photographer, who was at the time a film processor for a Winnipeg television station:

After previous unsuccessful attempts by employees of the station to photograph UFO's being reported nearby at Carman they were informed by station management that further efforts would not be approved. The photographer took the film on his own time and has said that he dropped the exposed film off at the station. When he arrived at work the next morning the film was already edited. There was a lot of discarded film (which he did not examine) on the floor of the editing room. The photographer says the film is not in the sequence in which it was taken and that there are missing frames. Mr. Rutkowski says that the station had later lost its copy for a time and had to borrow one from him.

A copy of a copy?

I have carefully examined a videotape of the sequence of pictures shown on the "UFO Coverup - Live!" program. Tracing paper was taped over the TV screen to note image locations. The film shows the objects in a 14-second sequence at "1/40th normal speed," according to the narrator

and a notation in the picture. If the movie was taken at 16 frames per second this would mean five or six frames were involved on .35 seconds of film. ($14 \times 16 = 5.6$ frames; $14 / 40 = .35$ seconds).

When I stopped each frame and examined each image I discovered that the images "blink" two or occasionally three times at each of 11 locations. All images at each location are identical in size, shape and placement, but images at other locations are different in each respect. These differences are probably caused by variations in the atmosphere which were frozen by the 1/16-second original exposures.

Instead of five or six frames of original film there seem to be 11 frames, because there are 11 locations. This means that the film is only shown at 1/20 normal speed and was originally only about .7 seconds long ($16 / 11$). Thus, the film seems to have been copied at about 1/2 its original speed, resulting in two or sometimes three new frames for each old one.

A light leak in the camera?

It has been claimed that a flash appearing on the last two frames was caused by the "UFO" and illuminates the horizon. I carefully examined these frames and found that the flash was in a different part of the frame than the "UFO". The edge of the flash is not sharp and does not show any horizon or foreground objects either illuminated by the flash or silhouetted against light caused by reflection, scattering or refraction of light from the atmosphere. It could have been caused by a light leak in the camera or in the darkroom. This was suggested long ago by Winnipeg investigator Ed Barker who says a darkroom technician showed him a piece of film taken with the same camera (a 16mm Bolex) with a similar defect.

"Almost instantaneously?"

It has been claimed that in the last several frames the object "jumps" from the lower right to the upper part of the frame and then "disappears". Chris Rutkowski tipped me off that two images of the object are on the same frame on a sequence in his possession. This is apparently what occurs at the "jump". The upper object seems to enter the frame from the right and moves across to the left and out of the field of view in a subsequent frame. A second object could have caused this, perhaps a

small plane entering the field of view. Employees of the local airport, where many UFO reports originated, have reportedly stated that no planes were near. The airport, however, was not equipped with radar and apparently no one checked with radar operators at Winnipeg. Thus, the presence of a small plane or planes cannot be ruled out. It has also been suggested that the lower object was a distant car headlight, which may have been substantiated by observers on the ground at another location.

There is another curious feature of the "jump" frame. It is only repeated once in the sequence, instead of "blinking" more than once in the 1/2 speed copy. A diagonal splice of parts of two unrelated frames at this key spot could account for this, for the two images in this frame, and for the "disappearance" of the lower object. This scenario might be supported by the photographer's claim that there were missing frames (many feet of film seemed to have been cut out), and that the images were not in the proper sequence. The lower light could also have become extinguished coincidentally when the upper object (a plane?) entered the picture. This unique single frame, however, suggests a splice.

An "ovoid" shape?

One claim made is that the shape of the image seems to be "ovoid". I carefully examined each image in the first sequence to determine if the shape could be separated from the effects of atmosphere or image smear from the motion of the object or the hand-held camera. In the 14-second sequence the major and minor axes of the images were compared to the apparent average motion of the images across the field of view.

In every case in which there seems to be an image which is not round (with allowance made for atmospheric distortion) the elongation could be explained by simple "smearing" of the image by motion of the light source, itself, or by motion of the hand-held camera in this .7 second piece of film.

The "ovoid" shape to the image in the second segment of film, with a red "echo" to the right and a green or blue "echo" to the left, could be due to the refraction of light into its spectral colors by the camera lens. Even the relatively round images of the objects on the first "jump" segment

have these "echoes". In this second segment of film a dim "trailing" light could be an artifact of a copying process or the tail light of a small plane.

A second version?

Another version of this film has been shown and televised by the late American UFO lecturer Robert D. Barry. It is a film which had been copied from a videotape and obtained by Mr. Barry from the television station at which the photographer worked several months after the incident (personal communication). This film carries no identification but it forms two segments of a "news" or "feature" report narrated by a then employee of the station. Is this film the station's "missing copy"? The station manager did not respond to my request for information or an opportunity to examine the film.

This copy of the film is different than the one described above and used in the "UFO Coverup - Live!" program in that it contains two segments of "UFO" footage, each with a 35-second portion in which one of the following three things seems to have occurred:

1) two frames of an earlier generation film were repeated 16 times causing the object to appear to be nearly motionless in the sky at the point when the narrator claims that the object was "hovering". This is the most likely of these three possibilities because, although the shapes and orientations of the images of these two frames are somewhat similar (see "A copy of a copy?", above), the images seem to shift from side to side very slightly, suggesting that two original side by side frames were involved. Also, the images appear in the sequence twice - three times - twice - three times, etc. which suggests that these two frames, which appear in other "1/40th normal speed" versions in this manner, were used.

2) The first of the two original frames mentioned in #1, above, was repeated 77 times.

3) This represents a copy of a 1/2 speed copy of a "hovering" sequence in a hypothetical original film, but that all other versions of this film, both "1/40th" and "normal" speeds, used for the "UFO Coverup - Live!" program and in the possession of other researchers have had this

sequence edited out. This seems a highly complicated and less likely occurrence.

The "1/40th normal speed" superimposition appears to have been done on videotape since it does not "blink" as do the frames of the movie with the "UFO". Since it appears over the "hovering UFO" segment used both in this version and the one shown on the October 14, 1988, program, one can assume that this "hovering UFO" segment was already on a videotape when the "1/40th normal speed" notation was added.

A third version of the "jump"?

The film in Chris Rutkowski's possession is apparently a third version, with another "jump" sequence. He has published two frames (1989b) which suggest a copy of a spliced film. He has pointed out a curious "echo", which may be an artifact of the copying process. This is clearly a different sequence than the two televised versions which I examined, above.

Conclusion

An unusual single frame appears at the spot where an alleged "jump" takes place on two different "versions" I have seen and could have been caused by a diagonal splice. A similar "jump" occurs on another published sequence. Another alternative for the telecast versions is that one light source coincidentally disappeared as another entered the frame. However, since another segment has a similar "jump" but no second object, this seems a less likely alternative.

It seems clear that at least one "1/40th normal speed" version of the Carman film has been altered by adding repeat frames. It is not clear why, or by whom, this would have been done. This alteration occurs at the place where the object was alleged to be "motionless" in this early broadcast version.

References

- Barker, Edward M. 1989. Personal communication. June 14.
 Barry, Robert D. 1989. Personal communication.
 Hartmann, William K. 1969. Analysis of UFO photographic evidence in Condon, Edward U.,

Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects, New York: Bantam Books. Pages 75-86.

_____. 1972. Historical Perspectives: photos of UFOs. *UFOs a scientific debate* Edited by Thornton Page and Carl Sagan, Rutkowski, Chris A. 1989a. Personal communication. July 7.

_____. 1989b. *VISITATIONS? Manitoba UFO Experiences*, Arcturus Books, p. 33. *Ufology Research of Manitoba*. May 13, 1975. The CKY film. Case 750513.1

Copyright 1990, 1995 Robert R. Young

Robert R. Young can be reached at:
 329 S. Front St., Harrisburg PA 17104, U.S.A.

The UNICAT Project - Continued from page 20

such as the file of well-known organizations (CUFOS, MUFON, BUFORA). For reasons not clear to me, the access to those files has proven to be difficult, sometimes impossible, unnecessarily complicating the procurement process.

As for MAYBECAT, it has also grown and now has nearly 1900 entries of which about 8% are marked PEN (pending), in the hope of obtaining enough additional information to upgrade them to UNICAT. This will depend, of course, on the amount of collaboration we receive from other investigators, and we think that our offer to open the UNICAT data base to those who contribute to the development of the Project is eminently fair.

We are convinced that nowhere in the world is there a source of information about the UFO phenomenon like the UNICAT data base. It is my belief that the answer to the problem of the true nature of UFOs is already embedded there, and that all we need to do is to come forward with the appropriate queries.

Copyright UNICAT Project

Revised 1993

New MUFON Field Investigator's Manual is now available from MUFON headquarters in Texas. Price is \$25 plus \$3.50 for postage and handling for MUFON members and \$35 plus \$3.50 non-current members. Quoted prices are in US funds.

THE UNICAT PROJECT

by Dr. Willy Smith

Basic concepts

When, in 1984, Dr. Hynek and I started the development of UNICAT, one of the objectives was to prove in a manner acceptable to the scientific establishment that the UFO phenomenon is not only real, but deserving of serious consideration.

To follow the scientific methodology, one must start by defining the subject of interest (in this case, the UFO phenomenon, as stated by Dr. Hynek in THE UFO EXPERIENCE and elsewhere), and then proceed to collect a representative sample of the items to be studied, i.e., high-quality UFO cases. The information is then entered in a data base specifically designed for this application, with random access to any of the 250+ fields included in its format; and it is not a mere catalog or listing of cases with coded sequential entries, like UFOCAT and many others existing in the past.

Criteria for the selection of the cases to be included in the data base had to be established, not only to eliminate IFOs as much as possible, but to insure a properly representative sample. Those criteria are rather stringent and too complex to be detailed in this review, but require among other things multiple witnesses, additional supporting evidence such as physical traces, and the existence of a written report on which to base the analysis. It must be emphasized that the conditions are *necessary but not sufficient*, and do not guarantee that the cases satisfying them will be automatically added to the data base.

The second step was to identify those repeatable characteristics appearing in the UFO reports, and formulate the data base on their terms -- not an easy proposition, as we do not really know a priori which properties are significant and which are not.

This first selection of the parameters applicable to the UFO phenomenon was done by Dr. Hynek on the basis of his experience, and was presented by him at several scientific and ufological meetings during the last two years of his life. As the project developed and more experience was acquired, new parameters were added as needed until at present we have 227 parameters, each identified by a mnemonic two-letter code (for example: HV = hovering, US = UFO silent, ML = multiple lights,

etc.). Other fields contain the information identifying the case, such as date, time, place and country. Duration, type of UFO as per Hynek's classification, number of witnesses and their ages, occupations and education, as well as other pertinent information are listed in separate fields.

Of particular interest is a field named FLAVOR, a unique feature which refines the definition of the parameters, expanding the flexibility of the system. For instance, the parameter EM refers to "*electromagnetic effects*" but may include many different circumstances, such as the complete failure of the electrical system of a car, television or radio interference, etc. Those will be detailed under FLAVOR (for example, 'EM: car radio and ignition failure'), the software having the capability to retrieve cases showing that particular type of electromagnetic effects.

When a case is being considered for inclusion in UNICAT, all the information available -- which may include an investigation report and one or more references in the literature-- is examined, and the parameters appropriate to the sighting are identified. The case is finally entered in the data base; or, if the analysis indicates that the information is inconsistent or dubious, or if the number of identified parameters is less than 10, the case is listed in MAYBECAT, an auxiliary data base to be described below. This last criterion is important, as it rejects those cases for which the information is simply insufficient.

In fact, what we do is to reduce the sighting to bits of information represented by the parameters, which after being entered into the computer are amenable to electronic retrieval and manipulation. This also makes UNICAT different from any previous attempts to computerize UFO cases, as each field is directly accessible and corrections can be effected instantly if necessary when and if new information becomes available. We express this feature by stating that UNICAT is a *dynamic data base*.

Evaluation

After a specific sighting has been accepted for UNICAT, a very important step is to establish its scientific value, a difficulty which frequently has been ignored in the past, when more often than not all the cases appearing in a catalog were treated on an equal footing in developing statistical conclusions.

At the onset, I want to point out that the criteria we used for the evaluation of the different aspects of a

case are by no means definitive, although UNICAT associates and I have worked hard on developing, revising and improving them consistently. We are open to suggestions, and I urge all of those who feel they have a positive contribution to write to the UNICAT Project.

As Dr., Hynek used to say, our study of the UFO phenomenon is based only on UFO reports, and thus it is edifying to recall how those reports are generated. The witness has the UFO experience, which impresses him as strange enough to communicate it to others. Eventually, the witness and the investigator get together, and the latter obtains information from the former, which is conveyed by the report. If the investigator is worth his salt, he also would consider other external elements, like the state of the weather, or the possibility of conventional explanations.

As conceived and implemented in UNICAT, the evaluation process has five prongs. The first element to be considered is the witness, as he was prior to the incident: education, occupation, age, among other things that could have a bearing on his telling the truth, as for example, what he has to gain or lose by lying. He is then graded A, B or C, on what some people would consider to be a simplistic scale. Perhaps so, but in the great majority of the cases, to attempt a finer division is illusory as the information simply is not there.

The second prong addresses the investigator/investigation, an aspect that has been grossly neglected in the past and is seriously deficient in the routine field investigations performed by untrained persons. Some attempts have been made to use the time spent by the investigator with the witness as a gauge of the quality of the investigation, clearly an incorrect approach which neglects many important factors, such as the experience and competence of the investigator and the time elapsed since the incident. At any rate, in the UNICAT scheme of things, this is graded also A, B or C.

Now, the report will have accumulated a certain amount of information, which can be divided into two types: the basic identifying information, like date, place, number of witnesses, UFO type, duration, references, etc., without which we wouldn't even have a case. And then, the bits of specific information as determined by the number of parameters that the analysis has shown apply to the case.

While the evaluation of observer and investigator is to some extent subjective, the amount of

information is objective as it is determined by the number of parameters identified for the case (NC in UNICAT's nomenclature). Based on that number, a third letter is assigned, as before, A, B or C.

After we have the case entered in the data base, we proceed to assess two more aspects. The first is STRANGENESS, which can be determined by the presence (or absence) of certain parameters. The thing to do, then, is to establish a scale of strangeness (ranging from 1 to 9) based on the parameters, and the computer will assign a strangeness value S to each case.

This is a tricky point and gives me an uneasy feeling when I see the word "*strangeness*" used carelessly in articles published in the ufological literature. I have worked on this for quite a while, attempting to improve the criteria used to determine strangeness, usually following suggestions from associates, but I consider that we still have a way to go.

The final aspect refers to how much we can believe that things have occurred as described by the witnesses. This has been referred to in the literature as "*credibility*", but I am reluctant to use such a term, which has connotations as to the truthfulness of the witness. Other factors are equally important, some of them independent of the witness himself, such as weather, light conditions and relative distance to the UFO, which contribute to increasing the verisimilitude of the incident. And of course, surrounding circumstances, like physical traces, or even police intervention, which in some countries is of crucial importance in view of the possible consequences for the witness.

For those and other reasons, I have assigned the name WEIGHT to the parameter (again ranging from 1 to 9) assessing the confidence we can place in an incident. Contrary to the situation with STRANGENESS, I feel that the concept of WEIGHT has been properly developed and implemented. Parenthetically, the assessment of UFO cases using S and W was pioneered by Dr. Hynek and we have been trying to follow his lead.

The determination of S and W is of consequence for the selection process, as it may determine the wisdom of keeping or rejecting a case considered marginal from other viewpoints. This is another example of the dynamic characteristics of UNICAT.

Access to the data base

As previously stated, the software is extremely flexible, and the information can be handled in a

very large number of ways to satisfy the requirements of the researchers. Access to the data base is immediate and free to those who have contributed to its creation, mostly the associates of the project.

We feel that we have created a unique research tool, and to accommodate other researchers who have never sent us any usable materials, we have developed the so-called PROFILES, obtainable at a nominal price. This is a relatively new feature and consists of a page summarizing a great deal -but not all- of the information contained in the data base for each entry. It is the type of information that can be mailed easily to our collaborators, and which facilitates detecting errors or omissions requiring changes.

Other data bases

Although the initial purpose of our activities was to create a data base of high-quality UFO cases, as we expanded our scope the creation of new data bases became unavoidable. At that point we started referring to the UNICAT Project -instead of the UNICAT data base- to better describe our activities.

Chief among the additional data bases that we have developed is MAYBECAT, whose role often has been misunderstood. In the initial stages of the project, MAYBECAT was conceived as a simple listing, a bookkeeping device to keep tabs on the cases already considered for UNICAT, but which for one reason or another could not be included there. That made MAYBECAT a mixture of IFOs and UFOs which could not be separated because the information available was not sufficient. Later on, Dr. Hynek suggested that we could use MAYBECAT for statistical purposes, to compare it with other unscreened catalogs (such as MAGONIA or UFOCAT). MAYBECAT also has a third use, because when those lists are circulated to the associates in different countries, sometimes they can provide additional information allowing us to upgrade cases to UNICAT. Admittedly, this has not happened many times, but it is an interesting possibility.

MAYBECAT grew with the years, and in May, 1987, it became clear that it would be advantageous to redesign it as a data base -rather than a listing- with independent and fast access to all the fields. To facilitate future work, new fields were added at that time, as for instance, a field named ASSESS, in which an estimate of the potential of the case is listed (some of the choices: *dubious, no scientific value, possible*). However, by now some entries

have been definitely identified as IFOs (about 6% of the entries), and purists have suggested they should not be left in MAYBECAT as there is nothing "maybe" about them any more. We contemplate moving those to a separate data base in the future.

One should emphasize that the information provided by MAYBECAT entries is not very reliable, and hence should NOT be used for any serious study, especially for statistical purposes. At any rate, within its limitations. MAYBECAT is quite useful as a device to locate cases -not good enough to be included in UNICAT-, when one doesn't remember exactly the reference listing that case. During the last few years it was found convenient to add some special data bases to facilitate research on special topics. Among them we have:

(1) ALLANCAT

It contains the 113 cases considered by Allan Hendry in his book THE UFO HANDBOOK as examples of UFOs, although applying the more stringent UNICAT criteria resulted in only a few of those sightings being accepted for the high-quality data base. Of course, ALLANCAT is a closed data base in which no further entries are contemplated.

(2) CREPORT

It contains ALL the cases mentioned with some detail in the Condon Report (103 entries) and it is also a closed data base for which no further entries are possible.

(3) CLASSCAT

Author: Claude Mauge (France). In preparation; has about 550 entries.

(4) ANDALCAT

It will contain, hopefully, all the cases reported in Andalucia, Spain, since the late 1930s, and is the first attempt to evaluate those incidents.

Present status

At present (Sept. 1, 1993) the UNICAT data base has about 825 cases, and each entry may contain up to about 6000 bytes of information which can be retrieved and correlated in an extremely large number of ways. In addition to these operational cases, a certain number of cases are being developed. I mean by this incidents that intrinsically have a good potential for UNICAT, but for which we don't have enough information on hand, although in principle the information is available elsewhere,

Continued on page 17